

A
VINDICATION

Of the Late

Reverend and Learned
John Owen D. D.

BY
A Friendly Scrutiny

Into the Merits, and Manner of Mr. Rich. Baxters
Opposition to Twelve Arguments concern-
ing Worship by the Lyturgy, said to be
Dr. Owens.

By a hearty Friend to all good Men, and of the *Unity*
of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.

*Detrahere, vel detrahentem audire ; quod horum damnabilis,
non facile dixerim. Bern.*

Rumor res sine teste, sine iudice, maligna, fallax. Tacit.

LONDON, Printed for Thomas Malthus, at
the Sun in the Poultry. 1684.





A Friendly Scrutiny into the Grounds of Mr. Richard Baxters Treatment of Dr. John Owen deceased, and the manner of it, in his Examination of twelve Arguments, never Printed; but, according to Mr. Baxters Title of his Book, said to be Dr. Owens. In a Letter to Mr. Baxter, by a lover of all good Men, and a hearty Friend to the Unity of the Spirit, in the bond of Peace.

Reverend Sir,

I Have some months since seen divers small manuscripts in the hands of several private Persons, containing reasons against some Mens attending to the Worship of God by the Liturgy, under their present Circumstances; and said to be *Dr. Owens*. I read over most part of one of them, but I not apprehending in them that Accuracy, and close arguing, as suited the well known abilities, and printed works of that Pious, and learned Author; concluded they were not his: or (at least) not the products of his Industry, nor intended by him for a publick view. And this was not my Opinion alone, but the sense of others, both of greater, and lesser latitude in the points controverted therein.

The first reports I had of your undertaking to expose, and confute them in Print, as *Dr. Owens* upon *hear-say*, was to me (all Circumstances considered) somewhat of surprize, though not altogether incredible. Yet I hoped your Prudence would obtain the ascendant of any inclination of your

B

OWN,

own, or motions from others to such a task : It being your often repeated advice, that in things Lawful, yea, sometimes Duties ; we are to consider whether they will do more good, or hurt ; and accordingly to act, or desist.

But the thing is done ; whether well, or ill. And I have found it in the hands of divers Persons of Quality, to whom you sent them, and from whom I perceive you are likely to have no great return of thanks, nor do I find it well relished by many of those, who bear a special respect to your Person, and are of the same sentiments with you in the latitude of private Mens Communion with the Parochial Assemblies.

But let every Man prove his own work, &c.

Dear , and truly Reverend Sir (for such the real Affection, and value I have for you, moves me to stile you) I beg of you to reflect again on this Action, and consider if it savour of that Evangelical Love, Union, Peaceableness, and Wisdom, which you have professed (and I believe sincerely) so great a Zeal for. Sir, I need not tell you for your information (but it may be you need a remembrancer) that in the best of Men, private, and sinful Passions may joyn with holy Affection, and serve their ends by it, and upon it : and that, where holy Zeal, a stirring nature, strong Parts, and an exuberant invention, and elocution are one mans properties ; a double Caution and wariness is more than needful : and such often overdo, seldom the Contrary. And (to speak my thoughts freely) I believe that as this ill circumstanced Action of yours is matter of grief to serious holy Persons of differing persuasions, (as to the points agitated by you) of sport, and scorn to haters of all Religion, and Godliness in truth : so upon the whole it may make work for your own Repentance.

I have had the advantage of some Personal Acquaintance with the worthy, & Reverend Doctor you presume you oppose, and also with your self : And I have that veneration for you both, that I cannot be insensible of what concerns either, much less of what concerns both in so high a degree. And had the Doctor, surviving you, trampled on your Grave, and taken such unequal advantages against your good Name, and Principles, as you have done of his ; I should have been under

der the same obligation, and inclination to embalm your memory, and adventured my going less in his respects for my pains.

I do not pretend in what follows, to maintain against you, that it is unlawful to use a form of Prayer, or comply with an imposed Liturgy, or under some circumstances to joyn in the use of ours in Worship. For beside the hazard he exposes himself to, who assaults such an armed Interest: Enough has been written *pro* and *contra*, already to inform, and it may be to tire any Reader, who knows what to do with his time: besides, the torrent of violence, and fear, or anger, its effects, scarce leaves men freedom, and quiet enough for a due, and rational weighing what is written.

Neither shall I undertake to justify altogether the 12 Arguments you have Printed as Dr. *Owens*, - in order to refuting them. If you had had a mind to be doing with them, nakedly as Arguments; such as they are, better or worse; without interesting in them the Reverend deceased Doctors Name: You might have done your pleasure, and displeased no body that I know of: at least not cast such a dead fly into the precious Ointment of the name of that worthy Person, whom your Charity places in Heaven, and whose memory notwithstanding, will be precious with the Saints on Earth.

But that which I proposed to my self was, according to my small Prudence, and weak Abilities, First, to signify to your self, and therein to others, whom by exposing that work so, you have interested in it, that there was neither Reason nor Justice in Printing, and Printing against those Arguments as Dr. *Owens*. Nor (all Circumstances considered) a compliance with that Honour, Love, and Tenderness, mutually due, especially from Persons of your, and the Doctors Station, and Circumstances, while living; much more from the surviving to the dead.

Secondly, That the reasons you oppose, (be they whose they will) are not altogether so tardy, and contemptible, as you make them seem to be. And seeing you were resolved they, and the Doctors Name should run the Gantelope together, and their weakness be your Weapon to wound him; a little Weapon Salve may contribute to the cure of his good Name by way of Sympathy.

And Reverend Sir, if I shall let fall any thing in what follows, that is contrary to that Respect I profess to bear to you, I can say it in truth, that it is not only beside, but against my intention; and if I can espy it, when done, it shall suffer a *delectur*.

The Manuscript of Arguments which you profess to consider, you all along superscribe D. O. to each Argument, which is enough to entitle him to them as their Author precisely, in common sense. Although all the ground you give for so doing, is, that they are *said* to be his, which you so express in your Title Page.

Dear Sir, do you not know that the world is full of Falshood, and the better part of Men subject to many mistakes, and not only innocent, but very hurtful, and injurious ones too. Conclusions are too often meer, or ungrounded guesses, and they that carry on such mistakes, are partakers in the imprudence, and the evil Consequences also, which they put out of their power to cure.

You say Sir, of a Book you reply to, bound up with this, that it is *sam'd* to be Mr. *Ralphson*, and upon that ground proceed to censure him accordingly. Whereas his *Jury* (who could not be supposed partially indulgent, and who had all the Evidences that could be procured, to prove Mr. *Ralphson* the Author, and improved by the Bench, and Impleaders, to that end to the utmost) durst not from common Fante, nor that particular evidence they had, find him the Author, and thereby expose him to the penalties. But Sir, you pretend not such particular evidence to father these on the Dr. but only that 'tis *said*; Your proceeds thereon are therefore more groundless, and the censures, and reflections you write upon his dust much more uncharitable.

But if it be inquired by whom it was said? So far as your Print pretends to (which I suppose hath made report of your best evidence, your wisdom being seldom wanting to your interest in such cases) it was by an *unknown Author of a Letter to you lately sent: Title to the Letter Printed, with Mr. Baxters piece now Considered*. In the second line of that Letter, which you say was Dr. Owens, viz. the *Manuscript* here concerned. (Also some of the Doctors Friends, who, or how many,

many, or what grounds they had for so saying, is yet a secret.) What poor Evidence was this, to fix so faulty a work (as you your self represent it) upon so worthy a Person? But although your Informers Person was unknown to you, yet somewhat you knew of him according to your Letter printed. And though it may seem enough to object, that the Book was printed off, before the Letter of this Person unknown, came to your hands, (or the other Chode you for answering) and this report could not be the Evidence on which you proceeded. To this I say, that then, for ought it appears, your Evidence was less then any ones; who did affirm it to be Dr. Owens, except common Fame? And, *non enimbus & non apparentibus eadem est ratio.* Moreover, when you had his Letter, and observed such a positive reporter of the Manuscripts being the Doctors, to be such an injurious frequent mistaker against your self; and in his reports to your self: it had been enough to persuade you to put a stop to the dispersing of the Book; lest that affirmation should prove a mistake also. And O that we were arrived to that practical justice, as to be as sensible of Injuries done to others as to our selves, and as careful to avoid having any hand in them! You say in your printed Letter to this Informer line 14. *But your misinformation tells me the pitiful case of most in the world. Your honest reproofs are founded on abundance of untrue conceits: There are about twenty untruths, through mistake in matter of Fact, in your Letter; and how gross are many of them? I shall leave the inferences from these words of yours to your own ingenuity.*

But let it be supposed that the Doctor had written somewhat called Arguments against Liturgical Worship; and delivered it to some private Person or Persons in his own handwriting. Could this be sufficient ground for you to print your Manuscript Copy, and deal so severely with it? Worthy Sir, I conceive, and not rashly; that it is possible, and probable there might be many variations in the transcribing, which it may be was done by many hands, and those none of the most exact: and by that time your Copy had its being, as unlike the Autograph, as a Boys Scribble is to an Artists Copy. And Sir, You know that every fair Antagonist will examine the Printers Errata, ere he will presume to understand the sense

sense of the Author examined, and to be opposed: which, how you could do here, let any discreet Person judge.

And if it be granted yet farther, that the Copy you Printed, and examined, were the Doctors; and the very Autograph it self. It may be justly presumed that he not intending it for the Press, but for the private use of some private Persons; he took not so much care in the Composure of it, as he would have done, had he designed it to the adventure of a publick Test. O Sir, how would you take it, to have any of your indigested Scripts, never intended (at least in that dress) for a publick view, and what concerned points greatly, and with too much animosity controverted, to be so exposed under your name, and dealt with so Critically, and with so much reflection? I have known you very tender in printing what was of great use, and not lyable to much opposition; without some plain intimation of the Authors consent; as in the case of Judge *Hale* of worthy Memory. And I take it to be a right in works of this nature, that the Author be owner, and disposer of them as his property; till he have made them common, and without limitation; as any other work whatsoever. But Sir, to conclude this unpleasant Section, I never knew a precedent of the like nature, and it may be nor your self neither.

I shall in the next place look into the reasons you give, for thus exposing the Arguments; notwithstanding the grief and reluctancy you profess at such an undertaking, against so holy, and worthy a Person.

First, Because, (to give your own words,) *The last sheet of my reasons for Communion being Printed, and the opposite 12 Arguments suddenly sent me, as being in many hands, and such as would frustrate all that I had written, if they were not answered: For the sake of such as have not skill to see Truth from Error, and misled by prejudice, and names, I durst not in Conscience let them pass unanswered; they being of such dangerous tendency, and so exceeding erroneous and fallacious.* Postscript. pag. 1.

To this I answer, that as to your mention of the Arguments, being suddenly sent you; I know not well what to make of it for your justification. For, it appears by this, that you had not the notice of these Arguments fathered on the Doctor,

Doctor, or at least not the arguments themselves, and their tendency; but after the Printing of the last sheet of the tracts, bound up together with this: And then your undertaking cannot be excused from too great suddenness, and precipitancy. Moreover it is a fair ground of doubting, that they were not in many hands; seeing they came to your hands; and (for ought I know, or you say) to your notice no sooner: And I know that I have seen a Copy of somewhat like them about a twelve month since, and I believe were but in few hands before your concerning your self with them.

But as to that part of the information which looks like the prevailing motive, that *they were such as would frustrate all you had written, if they were not answered*. Either you believed it, or not: If you did not credit it, it would have proved but *brutum fulmen*, and wrought no farther effects by you. But if you did believe it, I know not who can excuse your so easy credulity of that, which was not only improbable, but as near as can well be imagined to impossible.

Improbable (if you have given a right, and due Character of the Arguments) to work any such great effects against your Arguments, which you do not seem to suspect of any feeble parts, at least such as may indanger their main Cause, by whatever force assaulted. I must here necessarily transcribe your Character of the 12 Arguments, you take Dr. Owen to task for.

In your Preface, toward the end, *It's true that abundance of good people fear, and distast Communion in the Lyurgy: What wonder, when such reasonings as these 12 Arguments (which how gross soever, people have not the skill to answer) persuade them it is false Worship, and beinious sin.* Dear Sir, I fear that those people, who have not the skill to answer the 12 Arguments; will be found to want skill enough to discover the strength of yours. And I confess 'tis matter of lamentation, that on all sides Peoples Opinions are mostly, and most strongly (I will not say guided, but) mastered by their affections: and 'tis beyond all our power to cure the disorder, though the best way I know, is so far to lay aside all the very appearances of enmity, and bitterness; and to be clothed with so much love, meek-

meekness, and all that's lovely, that we may win their hearts; and then it will not be hard to influence their heads, *Ad modum recipientis recipiatur.*

But I have not said the worst you say of the 12 Arguments in contempt. You add Postscript p. 6. *The 12 Arguments I understand are likest to prevail most, by the honour of Dr. Owens name; more then by any strength that is in them: I was willing as long as I could, to believe that they were not his, they being as frivolous, and fallacious as any of the rest, and one Error managed with above forty mistakes.* Here Sir you render them very feeble things, but for Dr. Owens name; and yet you have contributed the strength of Dr. Owens name to them in Print; which you had far better have left out, upon more scores than one. But how long were you willing to believe they were not his? Not long to be sure; for it was a very little while betwixt your receipt of the Arguments, and Printing them, and intitling Dr. O. to them. How frivolous the Arguments are in your account; may be best understood by the Comparison, *as frivolous as any of the rest.* Among the rest were Mr. Warners, of which, you say in the next words foregoing. *Mr. Warner hath since Printed a farther Accusation, with the same charge of Idolatry, and false worship; against the manner of Worship not instituted;----- and said so little, that I will not write for him that cannot himself confute him.*

In short Sir, I know not Mr. Warner, nor his writings; but those you speak of, are so feeble, that he who cannot confute them himself, shall have no help from you; which in sense is, they are so easily confuted, that he that hath any degree of understanding, or that is capable of information, may confute Mr. Warners Arguments, if he will; and consequently the Doctors, being never a jot more invincible, if you can but get over his name. O for Moderation! This over-doing passionate work spoils all. Well Sir, I suppose you will allow me that the 12 Arguments considered nakedly, were not the danger you feared.

Yet I must not forget that I said it was next impossible (take them as armed as you can make, or imagine them) that they should do such mischief as your informer affected you with the apprehensions of, *viz. To frustrate all that you had written:*

written : We will suppose it meant of all the tracts bound up with this. Dear Sir, could you imagine that those Scripts would visit as many hands as your Prints, or that all that had your Prints, and might receive any good by them, would certainly meet with these 12 Arguments, and be conquered by them. I beseech you Sir, be not so easily persuaded by such hot-headed heedless reporters, as to make their reports, that carry precipitancy, weakness, and contradiction in their Fore-heads, the occasions of such distastful (and I fear worse) tasks as this.

The other motive to expose them is, the Doctors name being so prevalent. But I pray Sir, who gave them that name? Truly some few private Persons privately; but Mr. B. upon the publick Theatre, with a *Noverint Universi*. But Sir, you Printed them with the Antidote, both to the thing the Poyson, and the Vehicle, the Doctors name, that did so powerfully insinuate it. But Sir, what is this, but opposing your name to the Doctors? Your name thrust in voluntarily (some say violently) to his, drag'd upon the Stage after his Decease, against his will? Seriously Sir, though I have heard many of your Friends, who would rather be partial for you, than unjust, speak of this matter; I never heard one of them attempt an excuse for your concerning Dr. Owens name in your Print. And some will not stick to say (do you or I what we can to the contrary) that this is but the working of an old Spleen against the Doctor, and taking very ungently this advantage. But Sir, I am confident whatever the deceitfulness of sin may do, you would abhor the appearance of such an evil.

I have not overlookt what you have said, as well to justify your self from all prejudice against, or designs upon the Doctors name; as also that you have said to render it a strength to Weakness, and Errour; and a prejudice against Truth, and Argument. And indeed in many things you speak very honourably of him. But Reverend Sir, whereas you say, *It is so far from your design, to wrong the name of Doctor Owen by this defence*; If you have done, or it be the tendency of your work to do it, though the design be far from it, that will not be a just compensation.

Now Sir, I remember where you your self have hinted an excellent advantage to have avoided, much of what is now so distasteful. You say in your Letter to the unknown Author, *That the Doctor owned the ill Principle, which you now confute, viz. against all Publick Worship by Liturgy, and against mans power to command any more than Christ hath done in the order, and manner of Worship, and Church Government; and this to be seen in his Preface to his Original of Churches, his vindication of the Nonconformists, &c.* And you add also, *That for the many healing, peaceable passages in those Books you long purposely forbore all contradiction of him in it, (though you plainly answered his Arguments in your Cure of Church Divisions)*

When I look on the use you make of these passages, I am confirmed how different mens Construtions may be; and how cautious we ought to be of partiality. Sir, I find the improvement you make of the same ill principle in his Books (as you call it) is to countenance your opinion, that these 12 Arguments have the same father. But Sir, you know that as *many men, many minds*, so many men in some one Opinion (and that none of the best) may be of one mind: so that this concludes not they were the Doctors. Yet there were no great hurt in all this; but that you answered his Arguments, in your *Cure of Church Divisions*, is news to me; wherein I can find neither his name, nor Arguments, nor the names of the Books you say they were in, to any such purpose.

It appears by what you say, that the Doctor had in Print asserted the same Principles contained in his 12 Arguments; and not only at loose, but, *ex animo & industria*. What a brave advantage had you here, to have incourted the same ill Principles under the Doctors avowed name, all in a posture, wherein the Doctor had Harnessed, and Marshallled them for the open Field? Who would have said this had been surreptitious, or ungentile? or not warrantable by the strictest Rules of Ecclesiastical Combating.

Whereas, as the case stands, we shall not hear so well of it, nor will it bear it.

I have done Sir, with what I thought amiss (at least all I thought

thought fit to write) in the grounds of your writing against the 12 Arguments, and confuting them as Dr.^o Owens. The next things I propos'd to consider, was, What manner of Treatment the Doctor hath from you in your scrutiny into those 12 Arguments as his.

It is not only observable, but greatly observed, that in all this tract, you speak in the second Person to a dead man, which is such a solecism, or riddle, that I meet not with any that can reconcile to your Learning, or Candor. If it should be said that all this while you forgot your Grammar, or neglected it: That is not to be admitted: and if you did it upon design, I would you had explained your self, and saved me that necessary, but thankless Office. Should I say, you perhaps had no design in it at all, but did it from first to last, *ex improvise*: This would reflect too much upon your Prudence, and Care: But the sense of it must be had (people are so concerned at it) though it be at the charge of a diver of Delos.

There are only two constructions that I can obtain a prospect of, the first *less*, the other *more* probable. The first, that it *may* resemble those Poetical Raptures, wherein Persons are carried by the excess of some passion, to feign to themselves that the dead are living, and the absent present, to whom, as such, they direct their speeches, with a greater, or more grateful sense.

The latter, and more probable sense I take from a Conformity of this manner of application to the dead (as speaking to them, as well as of them) with a very remarkable passage of your own, and much talked of by understanding persons. It is in your *Postscript*, p. 7. in these words, *I doubt not, but his Soul [Dr. Owens,] is now with Christ: and that, though Heaven have no sorrow, it hath great repentance and that Dr. Owen is now more against the receiving of this mistake than I am: and by defending it, you far more displease him, than me.*

Worthy Sir, that you here affirm without doubting, (for your *I doubt not* in the beginning, qualifies all you say, to the end of what I have transcribed) that Heaven hath great Repentance, and that the Dr. *there* is more displeased by the defence

fence of his Opinion, which you call a mistake, than you your self: And that must be a displeasure of no small degree, if we measure it by your expressions of your own, at the defence of the said mistake. What soundness there is in the Opinion, that there is repentance, and displeasure to the Saints in Heaven, as aforesaid, shall be considered by and by. But if it be your Opinion, that Dr. O. will be so greatly displeased now in Heaven, at defending the said mistake by any on Earth; it must needs be your Opinion, that he will know if any such defence be made. And if his knowledge now in Heaven be so extensive; I, and all men that understand sense, will acknowledge, you did not so impertinently address your writing to him after he was dead: Only we yet understand not, when you expect an Answer from him, or how; except we must take that speech you have made for him, in your Postscript, to be *re vera*, the Doctors, and then you may have an Answer when & what you will. I know not Sir, whether you will take this as jest, or earnest, or both: I am satisfied it well suits to the Resolution of the Question, and the occasion by you given. What is next to follow, I am sure requires weighing, and is no jesting matter.

Your representing Dr. Owen in Heaven, so highly displeased at those who defend on the Earth his said mistake, hath two great Contradictions in it, to the generally received Opinion of all that I have met with, as to one of them; and all Protestants as to the other. Yet you say, you do not so much as *doubt* of it.

Is Heaven a place and state of perfect rest and peace, joy, delight and pleasures, without the least mixture of their contraries? Where *God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain*, Rev. 21. 4. And have you now brought it to this, that the Saints in Heaven may be affected with great displeasure? I know you do not make Dr. Owen's estate in Heaven, an exception to the general Rule, so much to his disadvantage. And if such as he, or your self, when arrived at that Blessed State, are yet liable to so much displeasure, what an allay of their happiness may they expect in Heaven, who in comparison of such Stars, near to the first degree of

of magnitude, are huddled among the unobserved *Sporades*? Dear Sir, I should have been glad to have found most of this passage in your Errata of the Printer, or Copy. I doubt not but the good Doctor in Heaven, for all his mistakes on Earth, hath feelingly and experimentally corrected this uncomfortable mistake of yours, that renders the Saints everlasting rest not such a rest, nor so desirable as you more truly represented it in your *Saints Everlasting Rest*, part I. cap. 3. sect. 3. *This Rest containeth a perfect freedom from all the evils that accompanied us through our course—And doubtless there is not such a thing as grief and sorrow known there.*

I would fain have persuaded my self by some distinction, to put a better, and more pleasant countenance upon the word *displeasure*, and agreeable to the heavenly Rest, but it was beyond my *Talent*: I would have reconciled its sense to mere dislike, or disapprobation; acts of the understanding and judgment, which may be exerted without grief, but displeasure I found would still remain, not only (*in tantum*) a privation of, but a contradiction to pleasure, as far as *dishonesty* is to honesty, or *disease* to ease. Oh how uneasie would the Saints in Heaven be, if they were liable to displeasure, at the pleasure of any on Earth, who shall well meaningly, or maliciously, defend their, or others Errors!

But I must not pass by the second most obvious sense of your words, which is, that the Saints in Heaven know what is done, written, or said in this world, after their decease. How can Dr. O. be displeased at that he hath no notice of? How will you be able to prove that he shall have notice of any ones defending the mistake you speak of. I am not sure that the Angels do not give notice of many things done on Earth, to the Saints in Heaven. Our Saviour tells us, *That there is joy in Heaven, and in the presence of the Angels, over one sinner that is converted*, Luke 15. And it is very congruous to the state of the Blessed, to have motives of joy imparted to them. But it is dangerous to be wise in these matters, above what is written.

You know Sir, what work the Papists make of praying to deceased Saints, either to do for them what they pray for, or to intercede for them at least. And that this is charged

on them by the Protestants, as Idolatry, or Superstition, or both. Now Sir, if they could gain but this point, that it is *undoubtedly* true, that the Saints in Heaven know what we on Earth say, or do, they would disarm us of our best weapon against that piece of Superstition, which is, that we have no assurance that the Saints we pray to, hear or know what, or when we pray; and therefore whatever their power or interest in Heaven may be, it would be absurd, and fruitless, and bear no parity of reason with our desiring the Saints on Earth to pray for us; for which we have a precept, and an assurance that we can acquaint them with our desires.

I know not Sir, what your abilities may produce in the defence and justification of such expressions: But, for my self and such pore-blind creatures as I: We dare not make such dangerous leaps.

What you say of Repentance, viz. *That though Heaven hath no sorrow, it hath great repentance*, is not so safe, and clear as to be swallowed without chewing: and is to me a very solitary notion, and it may be to most others that are no strangers to reading. The Greek words, μεταμέλομαι, and μετανοέω; whatever significations their etymologies, or their use in prophane Authors may afford, which are indeed very many, and various: we must stick to their sense in Scripture, when we put men upon the duty, and use the English word Repentance in that sense, or those senses it obtains amongst English Men, (when we use it in a general notion) who understand their own language.

I need not tell you that the more general, if not the only senses of the words in the New Testament, are in the Latin *Pœnitet, Pœnitentia moveor, pœnitentiam ago, & resipisco*, from whence are the Nouns *pœnitentia*, and *resipiscencia*; which answer to our two English words, Compunction, and Reformation, or Conversion, both in judgment, affection, and practice. But our English word, Repentance takes in both, and (when it respects men) sounds very lamely, and defectively without grief, or sorrow. And (not to speak of Repentance in an Evangelical sense, or Repentance to eternal life, which, though it be conditional of, and preparatory to eternal life, cannot in all the essential, and integral parts of it, be

be congruous to the state of the blessed in Heaven) Repentance in the common notion, and sense, in which we must take it here, is often understood of sorrow, and vexation, without any change of practice, or *after* Wisdom ; but seldom, if ever of *after* Wisdom, or change of practice, without sorrow, or vexation. And therefore, however you may come off (at least in appearance) by sheltering in the sense of forreign words, some part of the true evangelical notion of it ; it doth, and will sound very offensively, and most by far, will either not understand you, or misunderstand you.

If I may venture Sir, to shoot my bolt, to hit your meaning, ~I shall take it to be that, according to the Greek words, they shall in Heaven be *after-wisè*, or a Saint in Heaven shall *mutare mentem in melius*, have a better understanding than he had here ; and disapprove what he here thought well, and true : it might as easily have been so expressed, (if this were all you intended) and have saved many a puzzling thought, and untoward censure.

Another thing, Sir, in your manage of this work, that gives great distast, and I cannot contradict their censure, who say that it looks with a very unkind aspect (to say no worse) on the Doctor is, that throughout your examination of the Arguments (except the last) which you so *positively*, and *ungroundedly* intitle the Doctor to : When you conclude you have found a *mistake*, you mark it in a numerical order in the Margin, *viz.* The I. Errour, the II. the III. Errour, and so on, till you arrive at last to the XLII. Errour : so that if your Reader should forget a great part of your supposed Errours, found out by you in the Arguments ; he may be inabled to retain this black Character of the Doctor, that he was such an *erroneous* Person, that he was a man of forty two Errours in so small a tract, as might well be contained in half a sheet of Paper. From whence an unfriendly prejudiced Reader will conclude that his Errours in all his large, and manifold writings were *tantum non* innumerable. But though you were so severe, you were not less merciful than the Jews ; for you bated him those stripes, you might by the same Law have imposed on the last Argument also. Sir, this is not the common method of Theological Contro-

ver-

verſy, it muſt have ſome more peculiar impulſe to derive from ; whether good, or bad, I leave to the diſcretion of others, but chiefly to your own ; who ſhould know, beyond any Mortal, the temper, and agitations of your own Spirit : But I am not dainty to affirm, that if others examining your Writings, ſhould take this liberty to mark out all that is contrary to their Sentiments, it would riſe to a long ſum ; and as it would be very indecent in them, it would not be a little diſtaſtful to your ſelf : *If ye fulfil the Royal Law according to the Scripture ; Thou ſhalt love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf, ye do well.*

You ſay in your Preface, line 11. *Some wiſe, and good men will blame me for making our differences to be ſo much known ; eſpecially for remembering old miſcarriages : I obey my Conſcience : All theſe things are commonly known already, and we hear ſharply of them from God, and Man, becauſe Men hear not our Repentance, but our Juſtification : Had we confeſſed, God is faithful to forgive, Impenitence threatens our yet greater ſuffering.* And truly Sir, I take this expoſing old miſcarriages ſo frequently, with ſuch aſperity, and extremity, to be ſo liable to objection, that renders your Controverſies with thoſe you concern in them, both diſtaſtful, and fruitleſs : Nor doth it hear well from ſtanders by, of any calmneſs, or moderation.

Reverend, and worthy Sir, I beg your Candor, Patience, and Pardon,, for I may need them all (though I ſhall give as little occaſion as I can, or the thing will bear for their Trial) if I impartially weigh your own Objection, and your ſubjoyned Defence.

Some wiſe and good men will blame you for, &c. This you had a proſpect of, either from the nature of the thing, as meriting it, or that good, and wiſe men will miſtake, and be injurious ; or from what you have had experience of, upon the like, or far leſs occaſion. I will not entertain a thought of the firſt, for that were to charge you with a ſin againſt your own Conſcience : and not only the ſin of Preſumption (which ſome natures powerfully and inſenſibly incline to,) but alſo a preſumptuous ſin. I ſhould greatly wrong you, if I ſhould be ſo uncharitable. I heartily believe that the great Wheel that moves you is, a Zeal for God. But I think both the latter might perſuade you to expect the blame you ſpeak of.

Now

Now Sir, should you not well have considered this, & taken more time to do it calmly, & coolly than you did; seeing you knew *wise & good men* would think it blame-worthy. These were not rash, headless, heedless, proud ignorants; but *good men*, and therefore *well meaning*; and *wise men*, and therefore had skill to *say*, as well, as *mean well*. *There is that speaketh like the piercings of a Sword, but the Tongue of the Wise is health.* It may be you will say that you did also expect that some good, and wise men would *commend*, or speak well of you for it; and so there would be some against some. Dear Sir, believe me, that I speak impartial truth: I have known many wise, and good men blame, and not *one* commend it; no, not of those that in the points here controverted, are of your own Opinion, and Practice. What do you think of the healing Parliament, that provided by an Act of *Oblivion* against such remembrances? There was the Wisdom, Goodness, and the Authority of the whole Nation; Head, and Members against you. Did your Judgment consult this before you wrote it; or do you think it is *eximious* Christianity, to act the part of *Hyana's*; to feed on dead Carcases, when they have torn them out of their Graves? Or were the wise, and good men the far greater number, that were for thus *remembering old miscarriages*? How came you by the *Poll* to make such a conclusion? I think the Parliament (*in this Case*) might be so dead a weight, that all others could not counter-balance. Truly Sir, all these Considerations, without other Auxiliaries, should at least have stayed your hand for altogether in this matter, if not condemned the first motion.

In the next place it is fit that I give some account of what old miscarriages you are pleased to expose by way of remembrance, and place to the account of Dr. Owens Party, but especially of himself, as the Master separate. You fill up more than three pages, with one intire harangue of this nature; *viz.* from p. 25. to p. 29. *inclusive*. And you begin with what you say you will *pass by*, *scil.* *The Histories of Munster, and Muncer*; and of David George in Holland, and of Henry Nichols, and the Familists, which were the Off-spring of Separation: And the sad conflicts which they had against the sober Nonconformists.

D

Your

Your business is to make all the extravagancies the aforesaid Persons acted, and fomented, the Fruits of Separation, (as you tell us elsewhere) or else you produce them very impertinently. But I beseech you Sir, doth it follow that being Consequents, they were Effects? Have there not been as great Disorders, and Confusions of Civil Government, where there was no Separation from Liturgies, and great Commotions, and Rebellicious too; which if they had had success, might have arrived at as great Disasters, and Confusions as any other? You go on, and give a *substratum* of most of the miseries, and mischiefs, disorders, and extravagancies in Church and State, Spiritual, and Civil concerns here in *England* from the year 40. to 59. And I am of the opinion Sir, that as necessary as you make these remembrances to the refelling the Arguments against Lyturgical Worship; If you cannot overthrow it without these instances, you cannot do it by them. For, whereas the Argument lies against the Lyurgy, not only from the Consequences, but necessary effects of Lyturgies; (I will not say with what strength) your instances reach the Consequences, but not the necessary effects of breaking that boundary. It must be confessed that if men had kept to the Lyurgy, and its præscripts; they had not then separated from the Church, or the Churches worshipping in that form: And it cannot be denied that those who brake those bounds, were not necessitated to run *mad*, nor forsake *Parochial* publick worship: Else, how came it to pass, that when the Lyurgy itself was thrown out, the Parish Churches, notwithstanding, were as much frequented as ever they were, since *England* was a Nation; (and with as honourable a Ministry) and of those the far greater number, were not much offended at the Lyturgies expulsion? And those who took such extravagant leaps, might have stopt there, as well as others. But as to Confusions in State, we need not look beyond-sea for like instances: The Commons Insurrections, the Barons Wars in the Controversies of the Houses of *York*, and *Lancaster*; the horrid Tyranny, and Cruelties of *Richard 3.* will afford enough of Extravagancies, many acted, more intended, and no Religion concerned in the case. Yea, in *Hen. 8.* *Edw. 6th* time, were very great Commotions, and Contests for the interest of a

Popish, or Protestant Lyrurgy, which King *Hen. 8th* wittily called the old *mumpsimus*, and the new *jumpsimus*. And Sir, I have seldom seen strength, or calmness, or success in managing Controversies, and forcing Arguments from pretended Issues, or Consequences, *good, or bad.*

But Sir, Let us hear your defence, and it is this, *I obey my Conscience.* You know Sir what might be said, and what has been said of the woful issues of *obeying Conscience*: This may satisfy our selves, it is not enough to satisfy others. Yet Sir, you believe, and I too, that men must not cast off obedience to Conscience, and condemn obedience to it, because of the wretched effects of some mens Consciences, which are not to be imputed *simply* to their Obedience, to their Consciences, but to some ill circumstances, under which their Consciences are, and which ought to be conscientiously, and impartially examined, and corrected.

But you add somewhat for reasons, to satisfy your Readers Conscience, as well as your own, *scil. All these things are commonly known already.* Pardon me, Sir, if I believe, and say this is a mistake: your *all* is somewhat too many for this affirmation. Was it commonly known before you made it so (supposing the Manuscript to be the Doctors) that Doctor *Owen* ever said, as you affirm he doth in the following words? *That Gods Worship hath no Accidentals, that all that is in it, and belonging to it, and the manner of it, is false Worship; if it have not a Divine Institution in particular; that all Lyrurgies (as such) are such false Worship (and not the English only) used so defeat Christs promised gifts, and Gods Spirit. And this (you say) is the cause you write against, and bid your Reader understand it, or meddle not with what he understands not.*

Now Sir, the matter of Fact before us is to be considered. You begin your report thus: 1. *That Gods Worship, (saith Dr. Owen) hath no Accidentals,* and so proceed in a different letter, as I have transcribed it. Sir, you are not so little acquainted with writing, as not to know that passages affirmed to be an Authors, in a different letter, ought to be exactly, and precisely the Authors, without adding, taking away, or transposing a word, syllable, or letter that is material, especially when opposed. But that you have done so here, I

cannot find, after six times most diligently perusing all the Arguments according to *your* Edition, meerly for the examining the last passages. You set out with numb. 1. which is no sense, without a second; yet where you began, you made an end of numbring here; though you did not so of the Doctors Errors: I mention this, chiefly to shew how heedful you were when you wrote this passage. And let this go for the first note, which shall have this as a second, that you point not your Reader to the number of the pages in your book (which you might have done, it being in your Postscript) wherein these passages were, or any one of them, nor tell me in which of the Arguments they are to be found. This hath put me to more trouble to write a few lines as I ought, than some would take under the like difficulties to write so many pages. And I do affirm, that there being three, and but three compleat sentences in all; there is not one of them intire, nor in that order in any of the 12 Arguments. What may be implied, or the genuine sense of what is said in the Arguments, I do not here concern my self with. But certainly I ought not to be charged with *saying* any thing but what I have said *expressly*.

The first sentence or Proposition is short, and somewhat I find like it in p. 13. thus: *It is replied, there is nothing Accidental in the Worship of God.* You report it, *Gods Worship hath no Accidentals.* And I suppose, (waving the term *Accidentals*, as to its fitness in this place) that *having* no Accidentals, and no Accidentals *in the Worship of God*, are of very different Construction; being in it, making at least an integral part; *having* may take in variable circumstances of time, place, indifferent postures, and the like; some, or other of which are necessary to it as an action in *genere naturali*. And the Author, (whosoever he be) explains his sense of *Accidentals*, within 2 or three lines thus; *But all things duely belonging to it, are parts of it; or of its subsistence: outward circumstances are natural, and occasional, no Accidental parts of Worship.* And p. 16. of your Edition (for I have no other.) *Outward Rites, and Modes of Worship Divinely Instituted, and determined, do become the necessary parts of Divine Worship. Therefore such as are Humanly Instituted, appointed, and determined,*

mined, are thereby made parts of Worship: namely, that which is false, for want of Divine Institution. I doubt not but Dr. O. was able to find apt terms to express his sense by. But the Authors meaning by what I have said, is but this. All things of Divine appointment are necessary, necessitate præcepti to the Worship for which they are so appointed: and therefore every human invention, made necessary to any part of Divine Worship, is false Worship; because it is put into the room of a Divine Institution, which it hath not. Whether it be a good Argument, or not, I do not determine; but that this is the Authors sense, is plain, and so taken, is not so bad, or absurd as you make it seem to be. Now Sir, the abovesaid differences betwixt you and others, and the Doctor, were not all so commonly known already, and it may be were not in being, and so not possible to be known.

But for matters of Fact which you expose, and charge particularly, or by name upon the Doctor, I shall give two instances. You say, p. 27. *After the death of Oliver, his Son set up, and his Parliament first pull'd down (in which the Reverend Author now opposed, told me he was an Agent) and next himself. And p. 29. But I will tell the Bishops, that they should not be too angry with the learned Author of these 12 Arguments; for I know not three men alive, whom they are more beholden to for their restitution, by opening the door, and sweeping the way, and melting down, or pulverizing all that was likely to have resisted them.* Thus far it is intelligible: But I am directed in the Errata to add immediately, *than those of the Opinion he pleads for, (and now let him understand it that can) I speak not of the intention, but the action.* I think you have rendred him here such a meddling, mischievous busy-body, as neither the Bishops considering the action without the intention; nor many others considering both, or which you will, have any great reason to thank him: nor his Friends to thank you for these Characters. Yet you afford us one more that outgoes all the rest.

What they truly upbraid us with in malice, let us openly lament in serious penitence, and not stand to a sinful, dividing Principle, and Cause; lest the Saints be blamed, that have fathered it on God. This learned Author hath done otherwise himself, and so hath the Party now opposed. He and I knew the man, who was

Pastor

Pastor to the Commanders of the Army, when they pull'd down, and set up, and again pull'd down, till they had turned their Armed Bulwarks into Atoms: And when he saw what they had done, said, [I wonder the People do not cast stones at us as we go along the Streets] was not this a blaming of his Flock? He knew how oft the addressees of the Separatists to the several suddenly erected Sovereignties did change their minds, and cry peccavimus by their new Addresses for the old. And why may not we blame them that blamed themselves, for fathering their mistakes on God.

I shall a little comment on this Text, which would better have become the Observator, than Mr. Baxter, who will say as much for him, and those he calls Innocents: and Crucify all alike, as under one Condemnation. And surely some of these things were so far from being commonly known, that they must stand on your *only* legs for their credit, or none at all that I know of. You blame them, because they blame not themselves for these things, and yet tell the world they have blamed themselves, and how you can equal their worst Adversaries in a scornful, virulent, spreading it on their faces.

Worthy Sir, I pray bear with a truth, which I hope your piety will make some good use of (though it must be now in the after-part) I know not any man alive, who was less fit to throw these, or any other reflections on the Doctor; I speak it not in respect of your Abilities, which I value, and honour; but in respect of the want of that good understanding betwixt you, while the Dr. lived; which was commonly noised: I say not where the fault lay, I should have been glad to have been a means to cure, or conceal it.

But take things as they are, and it will be next a Miracle, if this work of yours be not impured to some ill Original; and then 'tis like to do little of that good you really intend by it. And I think you did not well weigh those words, p. 2. of your Preface, when you wrote them, *scil.* And the Author that I deal with, necessitateth me to recite the late fruits of Separation, &c. Dear Sir, do you not tell the world here, *who*, and what you had in your Eye. You say not here, the *master* of the Arguments put you on such a necessity

ty, but the *Author you deal with*. The Author, whom you will have to be no other than the late Reverend, Learned, and Pious Dr. *Owen*. No doubt but Arguments, be they what they will, must have an Author. But if they had been ascribed to some other Author (as your words import) there had been no such necessity on you to recite the late fruits of Separation, and what follows.

Some of the pretended Errours considered, as they are fixed in a Numerical Order, and ascribed to D. O.

THIS is a Task, Sir, that must be done with great Caution, not only with regard to your Answers, or your Person; but the subject: which puts the hilt in the hand of him that writes in its Countenance, but the point to him, who shall be so daring as to offend against it. But I hope I shall do nothing lyable to exception; for I shall not undertake any thing against the Lyurgy, or Communion thereby: only, fairly consider how far you have justly fixed those Errours, on the Author of the Arguments, which you call Dr. *Owens*.

Now Sir, I shall not take it for granted that your Edition in Print is exactly a true Copy of the Autograph, nor will, or can you your self affirm with any ground how far it is metamorphosed, by that time it arrived to your hands; therefore I shall think it reasonable to put the best constructions that equity will allow on the disadvantaged side. Only I must tell my Reader my Order, that he may know which is which.

The Author of the Arguments words are in the common letter with these notes, [" "] at the left hand of the line, Mr. *Baxters*, in a different letter, and mine in the common letter, except now and then a special word.

" *Position*. It is not lawful for us to go to, and joyn in
 " publick Worship by the Common-Prayer; because
 " that Worship itself, according to the rule of the Gos-
 " pel, is not lawful.

You

You answer, *I shall use the same method that he hath used, and first give you my Positions, and then the supposed matter of fact; and then consider his Arguments.*

Posit. It is not only lawful, but a duty for those that cannot have better publick Worship, without more hurt than benefit, and are near a competent Parish Minister to go to, and joyn in publick Worship, performed according to the Lyturgy, and in Sacramental Communion: And for those that can have better, to joyn sometimes with such Parish Churches, when their forbearance scandalously seemeth to signify that they take such communion for unlawful; and would so tempt others to the same accusation, and uncharitable Separation. The History of the matter of Fact must be premised, for the right deciding of the cause, which is as followeth.

I shall first say somewhat of the Authors Position, and then of yours. The Authors Position (as you Print it) consists of a Position, and also the reason or ground of it. And I find the reason exceeding the limits of what was to be proved: which makes it look not like Dr. Owens. But to take it as it is, the Position is [it is not lawful for us to go and joyn in publick Worship by the Common-Prayer.] He doth not say it is unlawful for any, and for ought you know, this *us* whom he concerned in it, might be a very few, to whom this Manuscript was imparted, and they might be under such Circumstances, as your own resolutions oft in print, would discharge from that Worship as a Duty.

But you may reply, that the reason of the Position gives no countenance to such a restriction. And I say so too: but seeing they agree no better in your Edition, what must be done in the case? But to have recourse first to the Errata, ay, & to the Author too: but as you have ordered the matter, *non sunt inventi* is a good return; for the Author was, but is not, and the Errata never was, nor could be. And therefore in my Opinion, if the Position be of a better Countenance than the ground of it, let us take that; but if the Reason be of a righter make than the Position, let us take that for the Authors.

The reason, as large as it is, is expressly inclusive of the Com-

Common-Prayer *only*; And therefore considering that all the Arguments are according to the Authors profession, *subservient* to this Position; and the ground of it: and otherwise are exuberant. or impertinent: I conclude you had not sufficient reason to say as you do, p. 2. of your Postscript, *That Dr. O. (or the Author) saith, that all Lyrurgies, as such, are such false Worship (and not the English only)* no, nor to say that it was his meaning.

But farther, I conceive the Author may not, yea, doth not mean by these words [because " that Worship itself--- is not lawful] that it is *simply* unlawful; which must render it so at all times, and to all Persons, under what circumstances soever: but that taken with all its modes, as well as matter, and the manner, severity, and universality of its imposing, it is so. Beside, it is not said that according to the rule of the Gospel, it is *unlawful*, but [according to the rule of the Gospel it is not *lawful*] which may fairly be construed thus. The rule of the Gospel doth not authenticate, or warrant it: and I think ought to be so Construed; it being the *defect* of that rule, not its *opposition*, which he lays the great stress of his Cause upon.

A short consideration of your answer (hitherto) will suffice; because you do not pretend *therein* to consider his Position, but to lay down your own Positions (which I have already transcribed (and that's enough) and the *History* of the matter of Fast, which must (as you say) be premised, for the right deciding of the cause: Which amount to the number of 25 heads. The first head I think very improperly called matters of *Fact*, at least many particulars contained in it. From first to seventh, you give an account of some Forms Divinely prescribed, which hath little, if any thing to do in the question. And for the instances you give of what was done, imposed, submitted to; how far, and in what manner, by divers Persons, in divers times, and of as diverse circumstances (which with the former take up full out *four* pages) I suppose will not be greatly cogent to the men of your Controversy, without some Divine Precept, or Pattern express, or implied. I may have leave therefore to proceed to the Authors premises, and your replies.

E

" Some

"Some things must be premised, to the confirmation of
"this Position.

"First. The whole System of Lyturgical Worship, with
"all its inseparable dependences, are intended: For (as
"such) it is established by Law (as such) it is requi-
"red, that we receive it, and attend unto it: It is not in
"our power, it is not left to our judgment, or liberty to
"close with, or make use of any part of it, as we shall
"think fit.

"There are in the Mass book many Prayers directed to
"God only by Jesus Christ, yet it is not lawful for us
"thereon to go to Mass, under a pretence only of joy-
"ning in those lawful Prayers. As we must not affect
"their Drink-offerings of Blood, so we must not take
"up their names in our lips, *Psal.* 16. 4. Have no Com-
"munion with them.

In your answer to this *Premise*, you say, p. 6. *I shall now examine the Doctors Premises. To the first I answer, First, If he will include all that is in the Liturgy, the Nonconformists confess that there is somewhat in it which they dissent from as unjustifiable; and so there is in all mens Worship of God.*

Sir, I cannot well tell who you mean here by the *Nonconformists*, which you contradictinguish from the persons you oppose, you somewhere in this piece divide a sort of men into *Formalists*, and *Fanaticks*, and p. 29. I presume the same concerned in your ranks of *Worldly PR. IGs* and the *unruly PR. IGs* for so usual are these obliging terms with you, that you need not doubt but *proud Ignorants* will be easily spelt in these contracts. But we have Coiners enough of disgraceful Titles, without the help of Persons of your Circumstances. I may guess freely that you put your self, and those *Nonconformists* that jump just with you, in neither of these divisions; but betwixt them, *i. e.* neither *Formalists*, nor *Fanaticks*: But there be enow will take the liberty of such Coinage, and put you, and yours into the Cub with the *Phanaticks*, and call the Contests between you, and those you here oppose *Bellum Fanaticale*. But I must pass from this divi-

dividing concession, to your next words, containing (as you say) the Authors *first* Error.

Secondly, *He intimateth that it is not in our power to close with some, and not with all: This is his first Error,* [which you score up in the Margin, as I have done Error 1. here; you prove it thus.] *Though Man gives us no such power, God doth; as it is in my power to believe all that one speaketh truly: and well; and not that which he speaketh amiss. I am not bound to own all that any Preacher, or Priest shall say in the Church. God put it in the Disciples power to beware of the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, and yet to hear them. Proving all things, is not approving all things.*

But Sir, The Author doth not say what you charge on him as his Error; nor do you say that he saith it, only *he intimateth* so much. And I cannot call this *f. ir* dealing; for suppose his words seem to you to intimate that Error, they may not so to him. And you know Sir, that many say such words, who deny, and abhor that which others say, and *know* is the just sense, or consequence of the words they express their minds in: But the Error you fasten on him is neither. Look again on the words that must intimate this Error, if any. [“It is not in our power, it is not left to our judgment, or liberty to close with, or make use of any part of it as we shall think fit.”] I will not so much suspect my Readers judgment, as to say any more to enlighten it.

Yet suppose he had said those very words; the Friends of the Liturgy I believe will consent to them as true, and now I shall prove that you have not proved the contrary. You say, *Though man gives us no such power, God doth.* But it is as plain as two and two makes four, that the Author *affirms* it of power, or *liberty* left us by the Law of men, and that requires compliance in all. I am sorry I must be fain to repeat his words again, but that will suffice; and they are, [“For as such it is established by Law, and not in any part of it only; as such it is required that we receive, and attend unto it; it is not in our power, &c. And Sir, take this, and what follows of *proving* not to be *approving*: and our license to distinguish what we hear: I humbly conceive they do not belong to the present question, and that though proving, to

discern the truth, is the duty (whatever be the power, a word easily mistaken) of those that hear, yet it is not the duty, or the liberty of those that pray by a *known Liturgy*: that may, and ought to be proved *before*, and not to be a matter of doubt, when they might before-hand have put it *out* of doubt. I hope you have not forgot that you have said this to be one benefit of a set, known Form, which a Ministerial, Conceived, *ex tempore* prayer hath not. When men Preach, they bid us hear, and the Ear tries words, but when they pray, they bid us pray, and by the *Liturgy* our Amen is required, and not our Opinion, or Scrutiny: In *ex tempore* prayers both are required to what is good. Your Author proceeds.

“ There are in the Mass book many Prayers directed to
 “ God; only by Jesus Christ; yet it is not lawful for
 “ us thereon to go to Mass, under a pretence only of
 “ joyning in such lawful prayers.

All this will be granted by all Protestants that I know of, but how far you render it short of the Authors end, is now to be considered.

You answer, *Though the Mass have many good prayers, the Corruption by twisted Idolatry, and Heresy, maketh Communion here unlawful. Heathens, and Turks have good Prayers. Prove any such Heresy, or Idolatry in the Church Worship by the Liturgy, and we will avoid it: But if I may join in your own good prayers, and preaching, notwithstanding your many failings, and such Errors as are here pleaded for, why not with others?*

Reverend Sir, Reasons against the strength of this answer are, First, The Mass is not more twisted in all the parts of it by Law, than the Liturgy, nor less to our power to pick and chuse. If this union do render the far greater pollutions, the Idolatry, and Heresy of the Mass infectious to the whole Worship, who can prove that the pollutions of other Worship, where we are likewise commanded not to distinguish, or divide, doth not in their kind, and degree diffuse the taint alike? Mental dividing, or culling by secret disapprobation, and not joyning in our hearts, is all you pretend to, unless you did allow (which you do not) Mr. Humph.

Fens

Fens manner, to say *aloud Amen* to every Prayer of the Lyturgy, except the Prayer for the Bishops, and to that to dissent by a singular silence. Nor have you proved that no other sin but Idolatry and Heresy, may justify refusing to Worship by the Mass; nor that far less sins than they may do it, nor that the Lyturgy hath not by some way or other such sin cleaving to it, as is like the Leprosy that could not be scraped; washed, or fired out.

Your instance of *Heathens, and Turks having good Prayers*, is not a very good one. What good Prayers without faith in Christ? Though they may be prayers for some good thing: and you let drop this Weapon without any using it, for your opposites to take up; for whose purpose it serves much more than for yours. There is no parity of a word, or sentence in a conceived prayer exceptionable, and the other intire, with all known, or doubtful circumstances. All men are not, few men are to be compared with your self for conceived Prayer: yet a man may find many, whose failings in matter do not pollute their Prayers; nor if they have Errors in their minds, do they put them into the words of their Prayers. These things you have not obviated in your answer, which to me is not sufficient to prove against the Authors Argument, that men must not go to the Worship by the Lyturgy, under a pretence only of joyning in such lawful Prayers.

“ 2d *Premise*. It is to be considered as Armed with Laws,
 “ (1.) Such as declare, and injoyne it as the only true
 “ Worship of the Church, (2.) Such as prohibit, con-
 “ demn, and punish all other ways of the Worship of
 “ God in Church Assemblies: By our Communion, and
 “ Conjunction in it, we justify those Laws.

The second Error you charge your Author with, is [“ That our Communion justifieth all Error 2.
 “ the Laws that impose the Lyturgy, yea, the
 “ po-nal severities.] *This (you say) is too gross an Error to
 be written with any shew of proof.* You endeavour to prove the
 Error such, by inquiring, *What if the Creed, or Lords Prayer*
 were

were too rigorously imposed---must we forbear them, or justify the Law?---then a rigorous Law-maker may take away our *Christian liberty* (you might have said as aptly our Christian duty) by commanding us to use such things so strictly. p. 7.

I answer, First. That you give us not the said Error in the Authors words formally. Secondly, That you add *all* the Laws, and the *pœnal severities* which are not to be found in the Author, and thereby strain these words [We justify those Laws] beyond their necessary sense, for you turn an Indefinite into an Universal, *all Laws*, and the justification of each Law to the most distastful, and exceptionable part of it: And I doubt not to affirm, that doing that which a Law requires, so far as the intention is moved by the Law, is a justifying of it: And submitting to any Law upon the consideration of its penalties, is so far a justifying its præceptive part, as not so great an evil as the *pœnal*.

To your proof I say, that a duty, though imposed by Laws, with penalties, remains a duty notwithstanding: and you know that the Author doth not allow it to be a duty, whatever you do: & he who doth that which is a duty, though not imposed by a human Law, may, and ought to be supposed to do that duty simply as such, unless he say the contrary: and therefore doth not at all justify the imposing Law thereby; which reaches your Query fully: But your Author saith it of that, which none that I know say is a duty simply, or without any dependance upon human Sanctions; which makes a wide difference: for things of their own nature indifferent, and submitted to as *Commanded*; this compliance must needs so far justify the very *ius* of the Law. As to the *pœnal* respect I spake before.

Your Authors third Premise is, that,

3d Premise. " This Conjunction in Communion, by the
 " Worship of the Lyurgy, is the Symbol, pledge, and to-
 " ken of an Ecclesiastical Incorporation with the Church
 " of *England*, in its present Constitution. It is so in the
 " Law of the Land. It is so in the Canons of the
 " Church. It is so in the common understanding of all
 " men; and by these Rules must our Profession, and
 " Practice

" Practice be judged, and not by any reserve of your
 " own; which neither God, nor good men will allow of.

In answer to this, you first distinguish of the Church of England, as an ambiguous word; which I must repeat, though you do not determine what it is. You say, pag. 8. it is ambiguous, 1. *As it signifieth a part of the universal Church, agreeing in Faith, one God, one Christ, and all essential to the Church.* 2. *And also as it is a Christian Kingdom, under one King.* 3. *And as it is a Confederacy of many Churches to keep Concord in lawful Circumstantial, as well as integrals.* In all these senses it is a lawful Association. I humbly conceive Sir, that your Reader is little edified by any of these distinctions of the Church of England, which do not so much as pretend to any definition of a Church specifically distinct from the Universal: but resolve it at last into that, which may be no Church at all; nor have any the least pretence of being so, *scil. a lawful Association.* Yet this serves your turn to induce an Errour of the Doctors thus, *But if any Church go beyond these bounds, Errour 4. and on good pretences shall agree upon any Errour or Evil, it is a mistake to hold that, all that incorporate with them in the three foresaid lawful respects; do therefore confederate with them in their Errour.* This is your fourth Errour.

Sir, I have searched narrowly into the Authors *Premise*, to find where he holds this Errour, or takes any notice, or hath any thing that senses of the Church of England under all, or any of your three-fold respects; much less that he holds, *That all that incorporate with them in those respects, do therefore confederate with them in their Errour.* The third *Premise* to which you answer, is here before the Readers Eye, in which the Errour must be found, or no where. And if all the Eyes in the World, with the help of the most enlarging spectacles can find it there, I am content to forfeit mine own. I beseech you Sir, doth the Author hold, or any man breathing, that to incorporate with a Christian Kingdom under one King, is to confederate with them in their Errour?

But in your numeration finding this the fourth Errour, I bethought my self that the last was branded with the second
 Errour,

Errour; but do what I could, I found the fourth Errour next succeeding to the second, and no such thing as a third Errour with his mark on, nor without it. In short Sir, (if you will bear with a very small criticism) you mistold the third Errour, and told the fourth very much amiss, I cannot like this manner of inflaming *such* reckonings.

I proceed to the fifth marked Errour, of which you say,

Errour 5. *p. 9th. It is therefore another of your mistakes, that owning the Parish-Churches, and Worship, is an own-*

ing of the present Diocesan Constitution. By the way, I will tell my Reader, that though many have believed, and stily affirmed otherwise, I never found any of your Words, or Printed Works, countenancing the Form of a Diocesan Church, or a Prelatical Hierarchy. I do not here determine of the Rectitude, or Errour of it: But I say it here, because the Errour charged, or the charging of it as such, hath some influence from the fore-mentioned hint.

But to the purpose, I must say Sir, that the matter or subject of this said Errour, hath some relation to the Authors *premise*; for a Diocesan Constitution is a part of the present Constitution of the Church of England: But for the Predicate which must contain what makes the Errour, if there be any, I can find no more of it than in the former, in all the words you say are the Author's *premise*. I beseech you Sir, doth he say a word here of *owning Parish-Churches, and Worship*? or do Parish-Churches, taken strictly in our Ecclesiastical sense, find the Form, or Name of a Church? Do you not know, that only the Bishop is the Pastor, all other Priests or Ministers but Curates? And if we try the strength of your *therefore*; by which you prove it an Errour, it will amount to little more: It is this, *But I further distinguish between the many Parish-Churches, and the Diocesan; and the Church of England, as constituted of such Diocesan Churches. The Old Non-conformists commonly owned the Parish-Churches, (and the Church of England as made up of such) but not the Diocesan: This they openly professed. It is therefore a mistake, &c.*

I did not expect such manner of disputing from Mr. B. You distinguish contrary to the Civil and Ecclesiastical Laws and Constitutions; and the Old Non-conformists commonly owned

owned your distinction, which distinction is a nulling of the Diocesan Church, from which the Parochial is not only distinguished, but separated : It is therefore an Errour, &c. Is this proving *per notiora*, or *obscuriora*? And all amounts to this : The Doctor, or Author held that Errour which you cannot find the sense of in the *Premise*, and you prove it by such Arguments to be an Errour (if it were there) that none will take for *unquestionable*, or at least *unquestioned* Verities ; and therefore this fifth Errour may be wiped off with the former.

VI. Err. *Also it is your mistake to say, that Communion by the Liturgy is the symbol and pledge of the fore-said Incorporation into the Church of England, in its present Constitution.*

In the matter and form of this, I acknowledge you come nearer to the Authors words, than I have usually found, tho not without some difference. But before I proceed, I must take leave to distinguish a little of *Communion*, thus :

1. Communion by the Liturgy is either very rare, it may be but once, or twice, or so. This I do not take to be a symbol of the said Incorporation ; nor can you give any proof that it was the Authors meaning.

2. Or it may be considered as constant, and such (taken strictly) I know none, or very few that practise.

3. Or an ordinary Communion, such as is more frequently, than with any, or all other Churches, contradistinguished from the Church of *England* : And this practice, I think, ought to be understood as the Authors meaning : And so understood, it will be hard for you to prove, it is not such a symbol. You endeavour to prove it thus, *The Rulers openly declare, that they take multitudes to be none of their Church, who joyn in the Liturgy.* I answer :

What Rulers do you mean, Civil, or Ecclesiastical ? Who, or how many of them, or when, and where did they declare this so openly, or secretly either ? Do they not own all the Kings Subjects of *England* to be of their Church, if baptized, and not excommunicated ? Yea, to the very Dissenters *de jure*, and that they are straglers from the Fold they belong to ? Therefore they first admonish, then excommunicate them, if

contumacious. Your Argument therefore from the Rulers is but dark, & *gratis dictum*: And I have prov'd it a mistake.

You tell us next what is the Symbol, *And it is subscribing, declaring, and swearing Obedience, which is the Symbol.* These are all your own words, and not one added. A Symbol I little expected from so learned, and intelligent a person, &c. The Symbol you give here, is the Symbol of the Clergy, or men in Orders: I hope you are not come to this on a sudden, that only the Clergy are the Church; and if this be the Symbol, or badge of a Member incorporated into the Church of *England*, and no other; what becomes of the poor *Laity*? You have not forgotten sure, that all this debate hath been, if not of the Communion of the *Laity only*, at least of meer *Lay-Communion*. You add, *Yea they excommunicate many that come to the Liturgy-service.* Some I confess but not very many, supposing the Office of the *Communion*, to be part of the *Liturgy* they come unto. And I shall add, that when they are excommunicate, they come not, or come *unwelcom*, till they be declared absolved. And I believe I may now have my intelligent, impartial Readers suffice, to send this Errour after its fellows.

Next Task is to consider these *Three* Errours, which are all in a file; which thus in short you express.

VII *You mistake when you say, It is so by the Law of the Land.*

VIII Err. *You mistake again, when you say, It is so by the Canon.*

IX *You mistake, when you say, It is so in the common understanding of all.*

You put me almost to a stand to come thus fast upon me; I begin to bethink my self, If you or I be not mistaken in the nature of a *Symbol*, as we had almost taken the Clergy for the only Church e'en now: I shall therefore spend a word or two in inquiring, what it may import: I find that it means a *sign* or *badge* to know *one* by from *another*; such as the *Colours* which *Souldiers* wear in their *Hats*, or the *white Handkerchiefs* about their *Arms* in nightly *Encounters*, to know *friends* from *foes* by: And I think our *Creed*, called the *Apostles* (I knew not well *why*, except because it is a *Composure* *worthy* of such *Authors*, or the number of its *Articles* being just
Twelve

Twelve as theirs) is therefore in the Latine called *Symbolum Apostolorum*, because it contains so exactly the *Essentials* of the Christian Faith (or at least hath been so esteemed) that you may know a Christian by it, from another man. Now Sir, I shall go on, and begin where I ended, at the 9th Error. [*It (scil.)* Communion by the Liturgy, is the Symbol "of the Incorporation aforesaid, in the common Opinion of all."] And if you take the *all*, not for all *men*, Heathen, &c. nor all in the *Kingdom*, or Church of *England*, of which many know nothing of a Symbol at all, but of Christians in this Kingdom, or elsewhere, any thing acquainted with the matter in hand: I believe our Authors *Errour* will prove a *Truth*, in the *common* Opinion. We cannot bring it to the *Poll*, and therefore being brought thus far, must leave it to the Readers judgment; but if any differ from me, or the truth *either*, in *this* matter, I shall not think it worthy to be scored up in Capital Figures, for one of his *Errours*.

If I prove that the fore said Communion is the *Symbol* of a Membership in the Church of *England*, in its *present* Constitution, both by the *Law* of the *Land*, and by the *Canons*; then the Author is not guilty of these *two* *Errours* you charge him with, and they will be returned upon your *self* as two of your own *mistakes*.

I hope you will not say when you think better of it, that a man may be a Member of the Church of *England* at the *present*, and yet not a Member of it in its *present* Constitution (though you seem to say so;) for then a man must be a Member of that which is *not*: unless you believe it hath *one* Constitution for some, *another* for others. The Constitution of it is the same, though the Membership is different; so that Person who is a *Lay-Member*, is not obliged for that Membership as a *Priest*, or *Arch-Deacon* for his *as such*; yet the difference lies not in the Constitution of the Church, which is made up of all the parts, in the order, and manner prescribed; but in the station of each Person, according to that *one* Constitution. In short, whatever *different* station Persons may have therein, Communion by the Worship of the *Liturgy* is necessary to their *Membership*, (which is the question) and without it there can be no Member of one sort or another.

The Law makes it the *Symbol*; for if the question be put whether any Worship be according to the usage of the Church of *England*, it is not *Sermons*, nor private *Conceived Prayers* will be taken for such, without the use of the *Lyturgy*: But the use of the *Lyturgy* will be so accepted, without either *Sermon*, or *Conceived Prayers*. I can tell you of a *Conventicle*, *Convicted in Kent*, which was kept on a *Lords-day* in the *Parish-Church*; and all because the *Lyturgy* was not read at that time, and place. *Recufancy* depends on the observation of the *Lyturgy*; and no other part of *Worship*. This alone is called the service of the Church either in *Law*, or *Canon*, and is therefore *prescribed* to be done in a *Surplice*, &c. which none of the other parts of *Worship* are by *Law* to be honoured with. He that attends not to this, is l able to *Excommunication*, by *Law*, and *Canon*; he that is *Excommunicate* for this, or other Crimes, must not be admitted to this *Communion*, nor to *Christian burial*, i. e. in *Consecrated ground*, or any where else, by the Office of *Burial* in the *Lyturgy*, read over his *Corps*, and *Grave*.

But it may be you will require proof of all this by Citations, though I think their mention is enough, to all that pretend to any insight into *Law*, or *Canons*. However I shall comply. The Acts *Primo Elizab. Decimo quarto Caroli Secundi*, oblige all to it according to the *Lyturgy*; which is thereby entred in matter, and form into the very body of the *Law*. These are the *preceptive* parts of the *Law*, which injoyne the whole to every Member, and no other but Members: for such these *Laws* will have all the Kings *Natural-born Subjects* in this Kingdom to be.

The *Canons* oblige to the same, by punishing all that shall speak against, or impugn all, or any part of the *Liturgical Communion*, or relatives to it as such, with *Excommunication ipso facto*; *Canon 3. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. and Canon 9.* all that separate from *Communion* by the *Lyturgy*, and count such as *Conform*, unmeet to join with, and combine in a new *Brotherhood*, are to be *excommunicated ipso facto*. And *Can. 13.* obliges to a total observation of *Lyturgical service*, to all Persons within the Church of *England*; and the *Canons* are said to be established by *Law*. I hope I have said enough to bring

bring off these two said Errours from that Character. Now Sir, I pray consider, that I have concerned my self in my inquiry as far as to your *9th* Errour on the Doctors score, and have said somewhat to all (except the third, which was not in your Catalogue) in order, without picking, or culling; and I believe you *your self* will see cause at least to *doubt*, that you have too positively, and rashly imputed these Errours, both for matter, and form, on the worthy Doctor deceased: who had he surviv'd your Print, he would not have needed such a silly Advocate as I. But you knew he was *dead*, &c.

I have done my main work, intended to the demolishing of that *hard-favoured* Monument, you had erected over his grave, and fame: And in its *room*, I shall give my Reader a *true*, though *defective* Character of him.

He was a Person whose Learning, Parts, and Piety, filled not only this Island, but also many other parts of the world, with the *acceptable* sound of his name. His Learning was *universal*, deep, and solid in his early days: which raised him to the stations of Dean of *Christ-Church*, in *Oxford*, and Vice-Chancellor of that *University*; which he was Elected to (and held divers years successively) when he wanted some years of the Age of Forty; a very rare example. And though his Years, Piety, Principles, and *strait* Discipline, with the interest he adhered to, affected many of the Heads, and Students with *Contempt*, *Envy*, and Enmity at the *first*, his *Personal Worth*, Obliging Deportment, and Dexterity in Affairs that concerned him in *that* Station, so Mastered *all*, that the *University* grew not only content with, but proud of such a Vice-Chancellor. And indeed such were his Temper and Accomplishments, that whatever Station, or sort of Men, his Lot, Choice, or Interest should place him in, or among; it would be no *small* wonder if he were not uppermost: *that* was his *proper* sphere, which those with whom he was concerned, generally *Couried* him into, and few envied, or corrupted. He was an excellent, and sound Writer; his Works many, some large; wherein he dived beyond *most* into the *less* obvious parts of Learning: yet was he so great an Ornament to the *Pulpit*, that for Matter, Manner, and Efficacy on the Hearers, he represented *indeed* an Ambassador of the
most

most High, a Teacher of the *Oracles* of God. His Person, & Deportment were so *gentile*, & graceful, that rendred him, when *present*, as *affecting*, or more, than his Works, and Fame, when *absent*; this advanced the lustre of his internal Excellencies, by shining through so *bright* a Lanthorn. No wonder the then *regnant* Party Courtred him, or that his Happiness should prove his Temptation. He was indeed sometimes a little *Impatient* of Contradiction (the common Companion of high Esteem) yet on *Cool* Thoughts, or the conviction of *Experience*, he would pay the greater Respects to those, who freely, and faithfully expressed themselves; he was not Nice of receiving Honour, and Respects from others; yet as free to return them, where they were deserved. He had indeed an *humble* Loftiness, and a *lofty* Humility. His exercises by *Afflictions* were very great, in respect of his *Children*, none of which he *much* enjoyed while living, and saw them all go off the Stage before him: In respect of *sicknesses*, very long, languishing, and often sharp and violent, like the blows of *inevitable* death, yet was he both calm, and submiss under all; In respect of the state of Christs Church, it lay so *near* his Heart, that if he were led to any thing that looked like too *sudden*, or *extreme*, it might rationally be imputed to *that*. His general frame was serious, cheerful, and discursive; his expressions favouring nothing of Discontent, much of Heaven, and love to Christ, and Saints, and all Men, which came from him so seriously, and *spontaneously*, as if Grace and Nature were in him reconciled, and but one thing. In a word, whatever he was, a mean could not contain him. Take him altogether, he excelled as a Man, a Christian, a Scholar, a Divine, and a Gentleman.

Sir, I have now done with what concerns Dr. Owen, I have been upon the defensive part of his Name and Principles which you have assaulted (unseasonably, to say no more) and who hath greater concerns to mind then such pitiful scuffles as these, if they were within his reach. And when I read, and considered that *ingenuous* acknowledgment of your infirmities, *Postscr.* p. 5. your loss, and disesteem of reputation, p. 13. (which I will not recite, because some may make worse constructions of it) wherein I believe you have in
your

your Humility, and *Self-denial*, as much overshot against your self, as you seem at other times against others whom you oppose: I cannot but after all *dislikes*, continue in the same perfect Charity, and respects for you, as formerly, and confide in the sincerity of what you say, *scil.* That though your writings contain some expressions that seem over-sharp, *you can bear twice as much from others*; which is a great, and exalted patience. I hope I have not taken a liberty so far to try it, which would ill become me, and I am sure I have taken no encouragement from this, your *more* than good natur'd indulgence.

After all that hath been said by you in the discourse above considered, I perceive your *drift* is (and I think you will say I am not mistaken) not to assert Liturgical Worship to be absolutely necessary, as you manifestly oppose those, and only those who affirm it to be *simply* unlawful: which it cannot be, if ever it was, or can be lawful to *any*; which is the sense of your words, p. 2. of your *Postscript*. Whereas I have written over, and over; that I persuade no man either to, or from a publick Church, till I know his Circumstances: And that I doubt not but it is one mans duty, and another mans sin. I believe, Dear Sir, that tho this concession may displease those who may best bear it, it may reconcile you to most of those who are called Dissenters. And you say also, p. 46. of the book, Let it be noted, that it is not all, nor the greatest objections, I confess, which I here deal with; *scil.* in the 12 Arguments] having done it elsewhere. Some of which you instance in, and others may be added; but how far they will go in the Controversy, I shall not, I must not say. We live not in the days of Trajan, when every man might think what he pleased, and speak what he thought; and it may be, such a liberty would neither be fir, nor safe. And if (as you allow) the practical determination depends on the Circumstances of the persons, you reduce the Controversy to a far narrower room, than was by many supposed. And every one being best capable of understanding his own Circumstances, it will not bear great heat, or importunity from another: This I say, as *Argumentum ad hominem*. I know Sir, how apt our natures are to sifdings, and to partial, unconsidered Animosities against those who

who do not *justly jump* with us in our Opinions, and every man to their interest; such mean Spirits are we of! Whatever others do, or say, or think, I *desire* to love *all* men, with a love of *benevolence*, and that which is good in all men, with a proportional love of Approbation, and Complacence: To carry it with a special love, and respect, to all that fear God, though not in *all* things, nor in *many* things of my persuasion: yea, to hold Church-Communion with them as far as the Gospel allows, & no farther; chusing Love, Peace, Communion for *their own* sakes, and for Christs sake: but Debates, and separation of any degree, only for *necessity* sake, and as a less evil than *sin*; To keep close to the Principles I profess in mine *own Practice*, to be Charitable, and Peacable, and not unwarrantably Censorious, and troublesome to those who believe, and practise different from me: To have mental Communion with all the Members of *Christ*, throughout the world; and whatever any of their Carriages may be to me, to love, and speak as well of them, as consists with Truth, or warranted Charity, whether they *will* accept of it, or *not*. Now the God of the Spirits of all flesh, dispose the hearts of Rulers, and Ruled, of what Degree, or Station *soever*, effectually, and *practically* to know their *respective* Duties, and therein the things that belong to their present, and everlasting Peace,

Let every Man prove his own Work, and so shall he have rejoicing in himself, and not in another, Gal. 6. 4.

Errata.

P. 4. l. 35. for *an*, read *the. ibid.* l. 36. blot out from the the word *sent*, to the word *also*, l. 39. these 3 lines being obscure. p. 5. l. 8. read *who you say Chid.*

F I N I S.

7

02205